

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically using the USPTO's Electronic Filing System (EFS-Web) on the date indicated below.

HELEN SAMSON

Typed or Printed Name of Person Filing Document

/Helen Samson/

JULY 3, 2007

Signature

Date

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK

In the Application of: Carter et al.	Attorney Docket No.: 6548-23-IU
Serial No.: 10/680,396	Confirmation No.: 5974
Filed: 10-07-2003	Art Unit: 1731
Customer No.: 38731	Examiner: Hoffmann, John M.
Title: DOUBLE-CLAD OPTICAL FIBER FOR LASERS AND AMPLIFIERS	

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Examiner John Hoffmann conducted a telephonic interview with Applicants' Attorney Peter J. Rainville regarding the above-identified case on Friday, June 15, 2007.

Applicants' Attorney gave a brief overview of other work in the field, summarizing the Background section of the pending application, including FIGURES 1A-1B and 2A-2F thereof. It was noted that Applicants' invention can be particularly useful in fabricating fibers known as "double-clad" or, alternatively, "cladding pumped", and is considered to improve such fibers such that the pump light introduced to the fiber more readily interacts with the core of the fiber.

Claims 1, 5 and 11 were briefly discussed. The Zhang reference, U.S. Patent No. 6,192,713 ('713), relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting claims in the outstanding Office Action, was discussed as well.

Regarding claim 1, Applicants' Attorney noted that Zhang fails to anticipate claim 1, at least because Zhang does not teach the recitation of claim 1 of "refraining from sintering that would cause said voids to fail to remain in the first sintered layer", which does not refer to refraining for only a short period of time such that sintering would be continued so as to remove the voids. Regarding the term "cladding", it was noted that "cladding" as recited in claim 1 does not read on Zhang's centrally located core that does not surround, even in part, any other region of an optical article of Zhang.¹

Regarding claim 11, it was noted that the term "discrete regions" may be broader than the term "particles".

Final agreement was not reached during the interview. The Examiner agreed that he would consider the claims and any reasoning or amendments presented in a Request for Continued Examination filed by Applicants.

The foregoing is considered to be a complete summary of the substance of the interview.

Dated: July 3, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Peter J. Rainville/
Peter J. Rainville, Registration No.: 41,263
Nufern
7 Airport Park Road
East Granby, CT 06026
860-408-5022
prainville@nufern.com

¹ Some clarification may be in order. Applicants' position regarding "cladding" is considered to be as stated above. Applicants' Attorney does not agree that, as stated in the Examiner's Interview Summary bearing a Notification Date of 6/22/2007, Applicants' position was that the core and cladding of the present invention are limited so as to exclude Zheng's "glass portions".